DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 088 731 SO 006 946

AUTHOR Baumrind, Diana
TITLE A Critique of Radical Innovation as a Solution to Contemporary Problems of Education.
PUB DATE Aug 71
NOTE 48p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85
DESCRIPTORS Authoritarianism; *Conventional Instruction; Criteria; Curriculum Evaluation; Curriculum Planning; Educational Change; *Educational Innovation; *Educational Objectives; Educational Philosophy; Educational Planning; Educational Problems; *Evaluation Criteria; Experimental Curriculum; *Experimental Programs; Permissive Environment; Standards; Student Teacher Relationship; Teaching Methods; Traditional Schools
IDENTIFIERS *National Institute of Education; NIE; NIE Archives

ABSTRACT

Without well-defined criteria for success, all radical innovations are doomed to failure. To facilitate successful experimentation the following are necessary: an outside agency to conduct evaluation; criteria of success acceptable to innovators and critics; and, in control and comparison groups, assessment and accounting of the initial versus final status of students, equation of the student-teacher ratio and education cost per student, and a similar high level teacher competency. These criteria will help to produce standards for decision-making by potential users of the innovation. (The opportunity to evaluate the integrated classroom as a radical innovation is available in Berkeley.) The following hypotheses about traditional programs should also be tested for comparative purposes: the most effective programs are those which assess the child's status and then devise applicable instruction; programs emphasizing intellectual abilities improve convergent, analytical thinking better than unguided discovery; effective remediation efforts require ability groupings or customized tutoring. A healthy educational environment depends upon educators who communicate meaningfully and know their subject matter, can behave rationally, value self-assertion and independence in children, and practice authoritative rather than authoritarian control or permissiveness. (JH)

ED 088731

1305
A Critique of Radical Innovations as a Solutions to Contemporary Problems of Education. Diana Baumrind. August, 1971.

NIE ARCHIVES COLLECTION - DO NOT DISCARD

50

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

August, 1971

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

# A CRITIQUE OF RADICAL INNOVATION AS A SOLUTION TO CONTEMPORARY PROBLEMS OF EDUCATION[1]

Diana Baumrind

University of California, Berkeley

According to the June 4, 1971 call requesting participation in a Berkeley conference concerned with plans for a possible National Institute of Education, "The desired outcome of the conference, tangibly, is to be a so-called 'Handbook for Radical Innovators Attempting to Work Within the System'."[2] Why do many educators assume that radical innovations, by contrast with intelligent use of traditional methods, are more likely to resolve contemporary national educational problems? Upon what bases ought we to conclude that radically innovative programs will succeed where traditional programs have failed? and what exactly are the criteria for success and failure of a particular educational experiment?

As an outsider to the field of education I find unconvincing the conviction or hope which many educators hold, that novelty will succeed where traditional methods have failed. I noted at the conference that educators who think of themselves as radical innovators disagree greatly among themselves concerning the goals of education. Seldom do they articulate their goals sufficiently to permit assessment of progress. Both criteria and the particular method by which these criteria are to be reached are frequently so vaguely defined that no real evaluation is

possible. Moreover, certain of these criteria (e.g. to create a cadre with revolutionary consciousness or a sexually liberated young adult) are viewed negatively by other educators. Thus the need for clear and honest definition of goals. At the NIE conference itself the performance contractors and the originators of prepackaged curricula had the least difficulty in defining their goals and showed the most willingness to be evaluated, perhaps because their goals are straightforward and their methods are quite traditional. Obviously an educational experiment without clearly defined goals cannot be evaluated and thus must be judged a success or failure on the bases of nonrational and extraneous factors.

Personal charisma and fervent belief cannot substitute for systemic assessment as criteria of effectiveness. While changes produced by the Hawthorne effect are undoubtedly facilitated by charisma and conviction, such improvement inevitably fades. Indeed, as Dr. Robert B. Davis pointed out in his memo of June 14, 1971, to the participants, few educational innovations have survived after the initial enthusiasm waned and the novelty faded:

> Now the history of educational innovations is extremely provocative: most innovations don't work out very well, and those that do don't usually survive very long. (One could add that most of those that do survive are either soon distorted into a betrayal of their original purpose, or else they turn out not to be much of an innovation, really, anyhow.)

My view is that without extremely well defined criteria of success,

all radical innovations are doomed to failure or to encapsulation within the situation in which they are created. A method, whether radical or traditional, should not be funded unless its goals are clearly enunciated and capable of objective evaluation. The criteria for evaluation should be formulated jointly by the originator (who after all should know what it is he wants to achieve), by the potential user of the innovative method, and by the critic of the method (who, like the originator, should be able to define goals the achievement of which would turn him from a critic into a supporter). Without formal evaluation a rationale for continuing to fund or to disseminate the results of a given innovation simply cannot be supported. The function of a National Institute of Education must be to change the present dismal state of affairs in which educational innovations "don't work out very well and those that do don't usually survive very long." This dismal state of affairs will never improve unless every program funded is evaluated scientifically.

The United States Office of Education has just awarded three enormous grants to the cities of Berkeley, Minneapolis, and Tacoma to finance experimental programs of education. In Berkeley, for example, 3.6 million over 30 months, with additional monies to follow up the next two years, have been awarded. These monies are in addition to monies for the same purpose from the Carnegie and Ford foundations, and to tax support of education at one of the highest rates in the country. If these experimental programs are to be evaluated by any but the most subjective criteria it is essential for at least the following conditions

to be met:

1. The evaluation studies must be conducted by an outside agency such as the Educational Testing Service. This should be a prerequisite to funding of any new program.

2. The criteria defining success must be clearly stated and at least in part shared by other educators. The criteria must be defined by specific measures acceptable to innovators and critics alike.

3. The initial status of each student in the comparison and control groups must be assessed and if not equated among groups, taken into account when the final status of the student and the change in status is measured.

4. The teacher-student ratio, and the cost of educating the student, must be equated among comparison and control groups. We already know the importance of these two factors in delivering academic skills and need to know in addition the specific contribution to quality education of each experimental program under consideration, over and above the general effects attributable to a high teacher-student ratio and ample fund

5. An equally high level of competence must characterize the teachers in the comparison and control groups.

Even if the above precautions are taken, as we know well since the famous Hawthorne experiments (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939), the experimental schools will have in their favor the conditions associated with an innovation -- enthusiasm and fervor will characterize the

agents of change, novelty and excitement will characterize the students, and in general an enormous investment of energy and interest in "making the thing work" will exist in excess of that found in an established enterprise. Since this "Hawthorne effect" is unavoidable, it is all the more essential that at least the 5 precautions stated above are taken to assure the possibility of meaningful comparison of treatment and control groups. In addition, in the case of the new federally funded programs, serious thought will have to be given to the effects of differences amongst the funded districts in public (i.e. baseline) support of education. It is conceivable that any particular experimental program in any particular district will be exportable only to districts where the tax expenditure per pupil is as high. It would be of considerable interest to request the participation in the evaluation studies of private schools within the districts funded by the federal grants, since these schools would provide a needed control for factors such as shared commitment amongst teachers, students, and faculty, and high per-pupil expenditure. The private schools committed to traditional programs would provide ready-made contrast groups against which to evaluate "radically innovative" programs.

Without careful evaluation an innovation which has failed to deliver the goods in one situation may be hailed as a success and thus tried in another setting, or drastically modified or abandoned, covertly, in the area in which it originated, as may be happening in Berkeley with the integrated classroom. Neither acceptance nor rejection of the

innovative program is based upon systematic study, and therefore neither action can be defended on rational grounds. It is possible that the existence of a pattern of experimental alternatives to traditional education is more the problem than the solution to the problem because it prevents the working through and gradual improvement of more traditional approaches to education.

## Integrated Classrooms as a Radical Innovation in Education Requiring Evaluation

Perhaps the most important educational innovation of recent times consists of the integration of the classroom with respect to ethnic and class composition. While its moral purpose is social justice, this policy will be judged by those it is meant to help by the extent to which its implementation results in the delivery of quality education to the disadvantaged so that they can compete successfully for jobs and status. If integrating classrooms interferes with the delivery of quality education, then the moral purpose which motivated its initiation will be defeated rather than served. The educational rationale underlying the policy of integrating the classroom with respect to ethnic and SES factors, and thus inevitably with respect to IQ, has not been articulated or tested. Implicit, however, is the assumption that children from educationally deficient backgrounds profit from association with children whose family backgrounds encourage achievement, but that the latter children are not affected adversely in their

achievement motivation by association with the former. This essentially is the conclusion to which Coleman (1966) came with data obtained from over six hundred thousand children in grades one to twelve. However, Coleman's optimistic conclusion has been challenged by Pettigrew (1967) and more recently by Bronfenbrenner (1970). In a re-analysis of part of Coleman's data, Pettigrew concluded that white children in predominantly black schools did perform below comparable white children in predominantly white schools, especially if these children had close black friends. Bronfenbrenner's study in progress seems to support Pettigrew's implicit assumption that modeling is a two-way street. He is finding that "the willingness of the rest of the class to engage in antisocial behavior (such as cheating on a test) is significantly increased by the presence of a small lower-class minority (in this instance, all white) [p. 108]."

Based as they are on much smaller samples, neither Pettigrew's re-analysis of the Coleman data nor Bronfenbrenner's study offer definitive challenges to Coleman's conclusions. However, if the tentative conclusions of these challengers are shown to be correct, we may expect an undesireable long-range effect from integrating classrooms with respect to ethnic origins and socioeconomic factors, and therefore inevitably with respect to IQ. The "model" children will themselves be altered so that the group norms in classrooms integrated as to scholastic aptitude will devalue academic achievement. This trend towards anti-intellectual values and actions right in the classroom setting will not affect an élite group of children with very elevated IQs whose parents have the

desire and means to send them to private schools with high academic standards and plentiful educational resources. Thus youngsters relatively advantaged in terms of IQ ability and educational development as grade-schoolers will have an even greater competitive edge as adolescents and adults; the unwanted effect of public school classrooms integrated as to IQ score may be to increase the range of abilities and achievement separating the highest from the lowest quartile in the general population. Why not determine empirically if this is indeed the case?[3]

The implicit rationale underlying the policy of integration has not been well accepted by the users of educational services. On the contrary, fully 75% of the American people in March 1970, according to the Gallup Poll, opposed bussing to achieve integration, and this figure included a majority of nonwhites interviewed. The Chinese population of cities such as San Francisco have strongly opposed bussing to achieve integration. Where integration has been put into effect, as in Berkeley, many non-whites have demanded the opportunity to reverse the official policy and to attend segregated schools taught and attended solely by their own ethnic group. Thus among the experimental schools instituted in Berkeley in 1971 there are two which are totally segregated by ethnic group, Black House and La Casa de la Raza, and one seeking funding (Equal One) which is segregated by ethnic group half the day. No rhetoric can negate the fact that the black, oriental, and Spanish-speaking population of Berkeley for the most part do not believe that integrated classrooms have accomplished their <u>educational</u> aims. Where is the evidence which

could convince these ethnic minorities that enforced integration of the classroom is of benefit to them? Neither the hypothesis that school integration will fail to achieve its goal of quality education, nor its alternative, have been tested. While all educational innovations require evaluation, the enforced integration of classrooms by ethnic and class composition is most in need of immediate expert evaluation because of the tremendous impact which this educational innovation is having upon the youth of our nation and the extent to which it is opposed by many members of all ethnic groups.

It can be argued with some force that enforced integration in the classroom will have as its long-range effect to deprive the disadvantaged child of the opportunity to learn by methods best suited to his learning style. If it is the case that cognitive abilities can be developed best by a customized educational program, then it is reasonable to hypothesize that the classroom situation most conducive to learning will not always be integrated by IQ or race or sex.

I would like to see the hypothesis put to the test, that integrating the classroom on the basis of ethnic origin and socioeconomic status, and as a consequence scholastic aptitude and life style (as has been successfully accomplished in Berkeley) has resulted neither in improved scholastic achievement and intellectual functioning for the lowest quartile children, nor in voluntary social integration among high school youngsters. Integrating the classroom, like other costly educational innovations, should neither be retained nor abandoned (a process beginning

this year in Berkeley) without proper evaluation.

The Berkeley Unified School District, with enthusiastic support from its citizenry, an enthusiasm demonstrated in action by one of the highest expenditures in the country per pupil ($1550, according to the Berkeley Daily Gazette, October 15, 1970) succesfully integrated its elementary school classrooms with regard to ethnic group, socio-economic status, and scholastic aptitude in 1968. Prior to 1968 most children were given the well-known and nationally used Stanford Achievement Test (SAT) and the Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Scale. It is therefore possible for an objective research unit (such as the Educational Testing Service, which among other innovative educational efforts has evaluated the Durham Education Improvement Program and the "Sesame Street" TV program) to design and conduct an evaluation study of the Berkeley educational experiment. (The State of California is in the process of phasing out the SAT and replacing it by tests with quite different norms -- the Cooperative Primary Tests and the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills. The SAT would therefore have to be administered by the researchers for comparative before-after results.) Among the questions such an investigation should be designed to answer are the following:

1. Have the scores of children in the primary target group (children in the lowest quartile at initial testing, and black children) improved significantly on the Stanford Achievement Test and the Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Scale by comparison with children of comparable

initial IQ in school districts still using ability grouping?

2. Have the scores of children in the top half or the top quartile of the original distribution increased, decreased, or remained the same?

3. If the overall scores have increased, have they done so in proportion to the difference in tax dollars spent per pupil in the school districts compared? (Perhaps, as many black separatists claim, the tax dollars, which exceed the sum spent per child in most private schools in Berkeley, could have been spent entirely on educating the target group in nonintegrated classrooms, with more success.)

4. How have children who have left the Berkeley Unified School District and entered private schools in the area, or out-of-city schools, fared by comparison with their peers who remained in Berkeley Public Schools?

5. Do group norms in classrooms fully integrated by scholastic aptitude stress achievement and intellectual values by comparison with group norms in classrooms less fully integrated within and outside of the school district?

6. Has the behavior of children (in the target group particularly) become more coping (self-directed, integrative, pondering) and less defensive (passive-avoidant, resistive of teacher's directives, negative attention getting)?

7. With respect to all these questions, what are the special characteristics of classes and schools where children show outstanding improvement -- e.g., principal's ideology; teacher's trustworthiness, warmth, skill, years of training; class composition and heterogeniety

with regard to IQ, ethnicity, socioeconomic status? (For example, the John Muir School in 1970-71 in Berkeley met the standards of a year's progress for almost all its ethnic minorities while most other elementary schools in Berkeley did not. How was this accomplished?)[4]

8. Are ethnically and intellectually heterogeneous youngsters of high school age (and therefore old enough to select their peer group) voluntarily enjoying each other's company at school funcitons and in the classroom?

Berkeley is an excellent choice for such an evaluation study:

(a) The cooperation of the citizenry in achieving the program of integration has been outstanding and the program has been exceptionally well funded; moreover, once integration became the policy of the district, teachers not in accord with that policy were asked to leave. Thus teachers are overwhelmingly committed to the goals of the district, although they are increasingly at odds with the administration concerning questions of implementation and disbursement of funds. (b) The pre-integration range separating the highest from the lowest quartile was abnormally high, reflecting the unusual distribution of test scores which has historically characterized Berkeley. The abnormally broad interquartile range was a result of exceptionally high IQ scores at the upper end, not of low IQ scores at the lower end. On the contrary, the scholastic aptitude (i.e., IQ scores) of the children in the lowest quartile exceeds national norms for children in that quartile.

Thus Berkeley provides a crucial test of the hypothesis that by

integrating classrooms with regard to scholastic aptitude, remediation efforts directed at the target group (QI and blacks) will be successful according to criteria outlined in points 1-8 above (or any additional criteria which could be operationally tested). The alternative hypothesis is that postintegration the relative IQ and scholastic aptitude scores of the target group will not improve significantly or will decrease, and that if school children who leave the district for a private school education are included, that the posttest interquartile range will be found to have increased over the preintegration range.

## The Case for a Traditional Approach to Education

I will argue here that all children, both educationally advantaged and disadvantaged, are served best by an educational system which takes advantage of methods traditionally valued by educators. Hypotheses concerning the advantages of traditional programs of education are as follows:

1. Programs which first assess the child's status using accurate and reliable measures,[5] and then devise specialized instructional methods designed as a terminal goal to produce the highest level of educational achievement and cognitive ability possible for that child, will be the most effective. Almost certainly this will require that different categories of students be taught by different methods. Students with widely divergent IQs at age 6 might be able, if they chose, to pursue similar academic curricula at age 15, provided that

each student from ages 6 to 15 was exposed to an educational curriculum specially designed to fit his academic needs. Both his educational weaknesses and strengths could probably be categorized so that custom programs would not have to be built for each individual; rather, programs could be built for persons with similar needs.

Important research is in progress which should permit educators to improve children's basic mental operations by changing the set of conditions under which children are taught, first taking into account their initial cognitive status. Gagné (1965) specified seven varieties of learning, organized hierarchically from S-R connections to higher order principles or strategies. He went on (1967) to describe in detail the conditions of instruction which should facilitate acquisition of each variety of learning. Jensen (1969) suggested that tasks which ordinarily require Level II or conceptual abilities could be altered to use to advantage Level I or associative abilities. Levenstein (1970) has trained mothers of low-income preschoolers to stimulate verbal interaction with their youngsters, and she believes that as a consequence the IQ scores of the children were raised by 12 points. Farnham-Diggory (1970) redesigned certain conceptual tasks to provide black children with "special language-action intersensory assistance [p. 80]." Bing (1963) suggested that in order to facilitate the development of mathematical skills in girls, mothers may have to withhold assistance to some extent. Hess and Shipman's work (1965) suggests that the child's problem solving ability is diminished when the language the

mother uses provides fewer possibilities for choice and contemplation of alternatives for action. As Farnham-Diggory said, "We have several generations of work to do before concluding that any child, black or white, who does not think well under one set of conditions cannot be taught to do so when the conditions are changed [1970, p. 80]."

The extent to which cognitive ability in adulthood can be raised by these efforts in childhood has not yet been demonstrated, and so these efforts must be pursued. It is not humane or politically feasible to assume either, pessimistically, that because of high heritability cognitive ability is for all practical purposes immutable, or, optimistically, that such differences as do exist at a given age reflect unequal levels of cognitive maturity among the children tested and will disappear with full maturity without special educational intervention -- although further research may prove one or both propositions to be true. The more disadvantaged the child the more he needs training in the skills, disciplines, and subject matter associated with traditional curricula.

2. Programs designed specifically to improve the intellectual abilities of young children will accomplish their curriculum objectives to facilitate convergent, analytical thinking better than programs which emphasize unguided discovery. The excellent work of Crutchfield and Covington (1965) demonstrates that training in productive or creative thinking can improve capabilities relevant to creative thinking. However, it is not known whether such training facilitates either acquisition of traditional subject matter or improvement in

higher level cognitive abilities. It does seem that unguided discovery is inferior in all ways so far measured to guided discovery (Kersh, 1958) of the kind Crutchfield and Covington have developed. Critical reviews (Gagné, 1967; Wittrock, 1966) of the literature concerning discovery methods reveal that there is little evidence that these methods facilitate retention, transfer, or analytic thinking. Lenrow (1967) contrasted the effectiveness of three preschool programs (one focussed on divergent thinking and creative skills; one on convergent thinking; and one a parent cooperative) each devised and administered by an experienced and talented partisan of that method. Among many other findings was the following: the program of convergent thinking which directly taught problem solving and logical thinking skills improved performance on tests of logical thinking and had no significant adverse effects on divergent thinking (some children were more likely and some less likely to engage in exploratory activity than children trained in divergent thinking.)

As in the Lenrow study, programs designed to improve particular skills through specific cognitive training are frequently successful, at least in the short run. One of the most successful of the programs in preschool education, using as criteria IQ related abilities, is that of Bereiter and Engelmann (1966). These investigators constructed a model with 15 specific instructional objectives, and then developed an academic program to advance the child towards these objectives. At the end of a nine-month period the (15 low-SES) children increased in

IQ from an average of 93 to 100 and were advanced a year beyond age level in reading and arithmetic skills. Educational programs designed to reach the academically disadvantaged should have specific curriculum objectives, as did the Bereiter-Engelmann study and as does the educational TV program "Sesame Street," and then be evaluated to see how well these objectives are reached, and when reached are maintained in various educational environments.

If Jensen's analyses (1969) of the components of cognitive ability into associative learning or Level I abilities and conceptual learning or Level II abilities has merit, then so-called "progressive" educational methods which emphasize discovery methods at the expense of drill in spelling and arithmetical computation may penalize children with lower initial IQs. If, as is almost certainly the case, associative learning is developed at an earlier age than conceptual learning, and differences between children with very high and low IQs reflect discrepancies in conceptual learning more than associative learning, then a program in the K through 3 years which emphasizes phonics, spelling, and arithmetical computation skills (which capitalize upon Level I abilities) would facilitate the progress of a child with lower IQ relative to that of his agemates. By focussing upon tools which emphasize associative learning abilities, school authorities would assign a positive value to these abilities. It is typical of high IQ children exposed to "progressive" education that they devalue rote memory ability and the spelling and arithmetical computational skills dependent upon such ability. This

attitude can seriously handicap their own educational progress. What is equally important, it perpetuates senselessly a devaluation of the person who requires a course of instruction which capitalizes on Level I abilities, and whose progress in school depends upon steady application rather than intuitive flashes of discovery.

3. Effective remediation efforts probably require that formal academic training take place either in ability groupings or by individual customized and tutored programs for each child. If the preceding analysis is correct, the sets of conditions which promote scholastic achievement differ qualitatively in late elementary school for children with different patterns of scholastic aptitude. It may be that elementary school children (especially grades 4-6) with IQs over 140, and well-motivated children with IQs between 130 and 140, will progress rapidly in an unstructured, enriched environment where they are encouraged to take responsibility for their own curricula, and given access to (a) very well-educated adults as intelligent as themselves who value scholarship and (b) a variety of great books, computer aids, and educational toys. The reason for this is that children with such high IQs almost always surpass their peers in conceptual learning ability and may be able to progress without drill in associative learning tasks, while children with low IQs whose pattern of ability shows deficiencies in conceptual ability but not in associative ability, require discipline, drill, and practice to achieve scholastic success. Children at the low end of the IQ spectrum probably require small classes composed of

children with similar learning strengths and disabilities, and should be taught by extremely skilled accredited teachers. Tracking has in the past had the effect of consigning children with initial low IQ to a nonacademic and sterile program of containment. It should have the opposite effect and parent groups should see that it does. There is no excuse for presenting "lower track" children with a dull oversimplified curriculum or routinely preparing such children for nonacademic careers. On the contrary, one long-range objective of ability groupings in preschool and elementary school would be to do away with the need for such groupings by midadolescence. We have yet to assess the effects on children of tracking according to IQ or cognitive style and then assigning the best teachers and most up-to-date equipment to the most disadvantaged tracks.

Today many children of varying IQs will choose nonacademic and indeed non-establishment careers. Perhaps these children, of whatever IQ, who together with their parents disvalue the acquisition of formal academic skills, should be provided with an alternative educational curriculum using discovery and inquiry methods, or one focussed upon cultural and human-relations type endeavors. Such classes could offer a larger than usual selection of nonacademic subjects, and/or be student rather than teacher directed. However, it cannot be assumed that such a school atmosphere desired by many white middle-class parents disillusioned with the effects of formal education will be of greatest benefit to black or low IQ children, or that their parents wish them to have this

type of education. In fact, the contrary is probably the case.

Many black educators and black children claim to prefer an educational structure which by liberal white standards is authoritarian, in which children are "made" to do things "because it is to their best interests." This preference (expressed, for example, by students at Black House in Berkeley High School) may reflect an awareness that for them drill and practice in a structured setting best facilitate scholastic achievement. Free schools are, after all, a basically middle-class phenomenon which may be totally irrelevant to the experience of Spanish-speaking, black, and white working class youths, or to youths with low and average IQ.

While I personally question the value of free schools even for bright middle class youths, I believe they may prove a disaster for Third World youths. Those who already possess social status, material wealth, political power, and professional success can afford to denigrate these outcomes associated with high IQ. But those who have limited access to such rewards desire them. The disadvantaged deserve to have options which they may then choose to turn down. Programs of instruction for members of lower SES groups should have as a terminal objective to promote pedagogical success dependent upon IQ-related aptitudes rather than to attempt to convince these members that pedagogical success is unimportant by comparison with unfettered exploration and creativity. While many individuals with relatively low IQ may be creative or excel in divergent thinking, there is no convincing evidence that such excellence is or will be rewarded with real power and social

status in our highly specialized society. Therefore, preventive or remedial educational efforts must promote competence in abstract, convergent thinking and the interpersonal and moral attributes which such competence develops. Educational efforts should have as criteria for success improved functioning in rate of learning, conceptual attainment, ability to make differentiations among and to integrate superficially disparate elements of knowledge, transfer of knowledge from one situation to another, facile use of language, development of strategies for accumulating knowledge, and all the other marketable abilities which an IQ test measures.

The preceding hypotheses define what I mean by a traditional program of education and suggest that such traditional methods may be more effective than radically innovative methods in delivering quality education to all achildren. These hypotheses should be put to the test and evaluated, as should hypotheses concerning programs whose creators view them as radical and innovative.

## Criteria Defining a Healthy and Productive Educational Environment

The following criteria, which are of course subjective, are achieved rarely in a public school setting. They have been met for my own three children in the private schools which they have attended, and if considered desireable by other educators and parents could, I believe, be met in a public school setting. Would the attainment of these preconditions for the educational experience be regarded as innovative in a public school setting? Would they

even be regarded as desireable by most educators?

1. Educational authorities who relate in a forthright and truthful manner with those for whom they are responsible. A child, in my opinion, has the right to trust implicitly the word of his teacher, the teacher the word of his principal, the principal the word of the administrative heads of the school district, and parents the word of all personnel associated with their children. I believe that such conditions of trust must exist in order for the educational enterprise to have nondestructive effects on children. Yet within the public school setting breach of contract and carelessness about making promises is more the rule than the exception. Participants with lesser power or access to the decision making processes feel (and are) duped and manipulated by those with more power, generally "for their own good." The NIE conference itself was characterized by promises carelessly made and "breaches of contract." Judging by the tolerance and lack of indignation of the rank and file educators present when the implicit and explicit terms of their "contract" were broken by the conference organizers, such unknowing violations must typify the educational environment in which these educators interact.

I will mention the following examples which occurred at the conference so that the reader will know what I mean by "breach of contract." (a) At one long meeting the chairwoman defined a set of rules designed to constrain the behavior of audience discussants of the eight specific innovations presented during this first day of the conference. In particular, audience discussants were told not to challenge the basic

assumptions of the speakers or to engage in arguments with them. These rules were enforced stringently until invited speaker 7 (Miss Alice Hosticka) presented her views. Her discussion of pre-packaged curricula offended a number of the more radical innovators who proceeded to heckle and challenge. The chairwoman did not intervene. Thus she unintentionally but unjustly violated the terms of a "contract" she herself had created. (b) Many of the conference rooms were extremely stuffy and noisy, and a building crew was at work in the hall. Participants at a conference have the right to expect that their physical comfort will be guarded sufficiently so that they can proceed efficiently with their work. This implicit expectation was not met. (c) One evening participants were transported by bus to a distant restaurant for a dinner meeting and informed that the bus would leave the restaurant at 9:30 p.m. to return them to the conference hotel. However, contrary to this commitment, no effort was made to end the dinner meeting on time or to see that the bus left the restaurant site when the meeting was finally terminated. Therefore, the bus arrived at the conference hotel more than an hour later than the time "promised," which meant that some participants (myself for one) were themselves very late for appointments predicated upon fulfillment of the "promise." (d) Reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses was handled laboriously and too slowly for some participants.

What is the rationale for such unclear "contracts" and for their breach? Perhaps the importance of the conference goals justified seemingly trivial breaches of trust. Perhaps the breaches were so trivial

that only the most sensitive and neurotic participants could be expected to be discomforted. Perhaps everything was so innovative that the organizers did not have time to assure orderly fulfillment of commitments. The above reasons typify those given to children and parents who express unhappiness and resentment at similar violations of trust within the school setting.[6]

2. Teachers who are experts on how to communicate meaningfully with their students as well as on the subject matter they teach. Many teachers as well as parents have come to the conclusion that they are not expert concerning matters which pertain to the young people placed in their charge. Since they conclude that they are not expert, they abandon their role as authorities. Morally they have a responsibility to become more expert, thus justifying their assumption of the role of authorities. Parents and teachers often do need more information about children of all ages than they have, in order to be expert. Much of what a teacher needs to know she can learn from observing the children in her classes and listening to their criticism. A teacher must permit the children in her classes to be socialization agents for her, as well as the other way, if the teacher is to acquire the information about the child and his peer group that she needs in order to make authoritative decisions about matters which affect the child's life in school. Unlike the authoritarian teacher, the authoritative teacher modifies her role in response to the child's coaching. She responds to suggestions and complaints from the child and then transmits her own more flexible norms

to the child. In this way, by becoming more expert, the teacher legitimates her authority and increases her effectiveness as a socializing agent.

But a teacher must also be a master of the subject matter she contracts to teach. If she teaches mathematics she must really understand the structure of mathematical logic and the fit between that structure and the structure of the child's mind in her grade level. It is not enough for her to be willing to let the child teach himself at the rate he sees fit to proceed.

3. Teachers who are willing and able to behave rationally, and to explain the rationale for their values and norms to the child. The teacher does not have to explain her actions all the time to the child, especially if she knows that the child knows the reason but is engaging in harassment. But a teacher does need to be sure that she herself knows the basis for her demands, and that the child also knows, within the limits of his understanding, the reasons behind her demands.

In authoritarian families or school systems the adult interacts with the child on the basis of formal role and status. Since the adult has superior power, she tells the child what to do and does not permit herself to be affected by what he says or does. Where adults do not consult with children on decisions affecting the children, authority can rest only on power. As the child reaches adolescence the relative powers of adult and child shift, and thus the basis for adult authority is undermined at a time when the child still needs the

polarizing influence of a strong adult.

4. Teachers who value self-assertion, willfulness, and independence in the child and particularly in the adolescent. The imposition of authority even against the child's will is useful to the child during the first six years, the period Dubin and Dubin (1963) refer to as the Authority Inception period. Indeed, power serves to legitimate authority in the mind of the child, to assure the child that his parent has the power to protect him and provide for his needs. The major way in which adults exercise power in the early years is by manipulating the reinforcing and punishing stimuli which affect the child. What makes an adult a successful reinforcing agent or an attractive model for a child to imitate is her effective power to give the child what he needs -- i.e., the adult's control over resources which the child desires, and her willingness and ability to provide the child with these resources in such a manner and at such a time that the child will be gratified and the family group or classroom benefited. Thus, practically as well as morally, gratification of the child's needs is a precondition for the effective imposition of adult authority. An exploited or manipulated child cannot be controlled effectively over a long period of time. The adult's ability to gratify the child and to withhold gratification, and to do so on bases which are internally consistent, legitimates her authority in the mind of the child. The child, unlike the adolescent, has not yet reached the level of cognitive development where he can legitimate authority, or object to its imposition, on a principled basis.

By early adolescence, however, power based on physical strength and control of resources cannot and should not be used to legitimate authority. The young person is now capable of formal operational thought. He can formulate principles of choice by which to judge his own actions and the actions of others. He has the conceptual ability to be critical even though he may lack the wisdom to moderate his criticism. He can see clearly many alternatives to adult directives; and the adult must be prepared to defend rationally, as she would to another adult, a directive with which the adolescent disagrees. Moreover, the asymmetry of power which characterizes childhood no longer exists at adolescence. The adolescent cannot be forced physically to obey over any period of time. He has access to many alternative resources, and these include not only peers but adults who are highly identified with the peer culture.

When an adolescent refuses to do as a parent or teacher wishes, it is essential that the adult learn why the child will not obey. Through the dialogue which ensues, the adult may learn that her directive was unjust; or the adolescent may learn that the adult's directive could be legitimated. In any case, a head-on confrontation is avoided. While head-on confrontation won by the adult serves to strengthen adult authority in the first six years, it produces conflict about adult authority during adolescence, and often premature rebellion against all adult authority. A parent or teacher should not expect loyalty to her beliefs and values. An adolescent's loyalty belongs to the future and he can bring along from the past only those beliefs and values which he believes

fit the historical necessities of his own time. The adolescent's responsibility to his parent or teacher may be said to consist of keeping in touch provided that the adult herself remains receptive.

Although a young person need feel no commitment to the social ethic of his parents' generation, he does have, while he is dependent upon his parents and teachers, a moral responsibility to obey rational authority, i.e., authority based on explicit, mutually agreed upon principles. The just restrictions on his freedom provide the adolescent with the major impetus to become self-supporting and responsible to himself rather than to his parents and teachers.

5. Teachers who practice authoritative, rather than authoritarian or permissive, control in their classrooms. A pattern of parental authority was identified by the author in two studies (Baumrind, 1967, 1971a) and designated as Authoritative. The Authoritative adult, as identified in these studies, attempts to direct the child's activities in a rational, issue-oriented manner. She encourages verbal give and take, shares with the child the reasoning behind her policy, and solicits his objections when he refuses to conform. Both autonomous self-will and disciplined conformity are valued by the authoritative parent. Therefore, she exerts firm control at points of parent-child divergence, but does not hem the child in with restrictions. She enforces her own perspective as an adult, but recognizes the child's individual interests and special ways. The authoritative parent affirms the child's present qualities, but also sets standards for future conduct. She uses reason,

power, and shaping by regime and reinforcement to achieve her objectives, and does not base her decisions on group consensus or the individual child's desires. Authoritative control differs significantly from both authoritarian control and permissive noncontrol.

The Authoritarian adult values obedience as a virtue and favors punitive, forceful measures to curb self-will at points where the child's actions or beliefs conflict with what she thinks is right conduct. She believes in keeping the child in his place, in restricting his autonomy, and in assigning household responsibilities in order to inculcate respect for work. She regards the preservation of order and traditional structure as a highly valued end in itself. She does not encourage verbal give and take, believing that the child should accept her word for what is right.

The Permissive prototype of adult control requires of the adult that she behave in an affirmative, acceptant, and benign manner towards the child's impulses and actions and that she present herself to the child as a resource for him to use as he wishes, but not as an active agent responsible for shaping and altering his ongoing and future behavior. The immediate aim of the ideologically aware permissive parent or teacher is to free the child from restraint as much as is consistent with survival.

## Discipline in the Home and Classroom

In two separate studies (Baumrind, 1967, 1971a) several patterns

of parental authority were identified, including patterns corresponding to the Authoritative, Authoritarian, and Permissive just described. In one study three groups of normal preschool children differing in social and emotional behavior were identified in order that the child-rearing behavior of their parents could be contrasted. Conclusions from that study can be summarized briefly as follows:

1. Parents of the children who were the most socially responsible and independent were themselves controlling and demanding; but they were also warm, rational, and receptive to the child's communication. This unique combination of high control and positive encouragement of the child's autonomous and independent strivings was called authoritative parental behavior.

2. Parents of children who, relative to the others, were discontent, withdrawn, and distrustful, were themselves detached and controlling, and somewhat less warm than other parents. They were called authoritarian parents.

3. Parents of the least socially responsible and independent children were themselves non-controlling, non-demanding, and relatively warm. These were called permissive parents.

In the second study 8 patterns of parental authority were identified (Authoritarian; Authoritative; Authoritative-Nonconforming; Nonconforming; Nonconforming-Permissive; Permissive; Rejecting-Neglecting; and Authoritarian-Rejecting-Neglecting) and the social and emotional behavior of their preschool children contrasted. Among the conclusions

were the following:

Authoritative parents, compared to other patterns studied, were most likely to facilitate the development of instrumental competence in young children, defined by high scores on both Social Responsibility and Independence. While true as an over-all generalization, the following qualifications should be stated:

1. Authoritative parental behavior, compared to all other patterns of parental authority, while clearly associated with Independent, Purposive, Dominant behavior in girls, was associated strongly with the same behavior in boys only when the parents were also somewhat Nonconforming.

2. Authoritative parental control, compared to Authoritarian and Permissive parental control, while clearly associated with all indices of Social Responsibility in boys, was clearly associated in girls only with high Achievement, and not with Friendly and Cooperative behavior. In fact, when parents were Nonconforming as well as Authoritative, girls were Hostile and Resistive as well as extremely Independent.

Some quotations from Rambusch, in describing the Montessori method, illustrate the way in which authoritative control is used to resolve the antithesis between pleasure and duty, and between freedom and responsibility, in the school setting:

> The discipline resides in three areas in a Montessori classroom: It resides in the environment itself which is controlled; in the teacher herself who is controlled and is ready to assume an authoritarian

role if it is necessary; and from the very beginning it resides in the children. It is a three-way arrangement, as opposed to certain types of American education in which all of the authority is vested in the teacher, or where, in the caricature of permissive education, all of the authority is vested in the children [1962, pp. 49-50].

When a child has finished his work he is free to put it away, he is free to initiate new work or, in certain instances, he is free not to work. But he is not free to disturb or destroy what others are doing. If the day is arranged in such a way that at a certain time the teacher must demand of the children that they arbitrarily finish what they are doing -- if it is lunch time, or recess or whatever -- the child must accommodate himself to the demand of the group. It is largely a question of balance. In a Montessori class the teacher does not delude herself into believing that her manipulation of the children represents their consensus of what they would like to do. If she is manipulating them insofar as she is determining arbitrarily that this must be done at this time, she is cognizant of what she is doing, which the child may or may not be [p. 51].

The importance of the responsibility in selecting matter for the child to learn is placed in the hands of those adults who are aware of what the culture will demand of the child and who are able to "program" learning in such a way that what is suitable for the child's age and stage of development is also learnable and pleasureable to him. Both Dewey and Montessori feel that interest and discipline are connected and

not opposed. Dewey himself decried unrestrained freedom of action in speech, in manners, and lack of manners. He was, in fact, critical of all those progressive schools that carried the thing they call freedom nearly to the point of anarchy [p. 63].

The model of authoritative control presented here obviously differs strikingly from that of A.S. Neill, particularly with regard to the meaning assigned the concept of freedom. To Neill, freedom for the child means that he has the liberty to do as he pleases without interference from adult guardians and, indeed, with their protection. The alternative to adult control, according to Neill, is to permit the child to be self-regulated, free of restraint, and unconcerned about expression of impulse or the effects of his carelessness:

> Self-regulation means the right of a baby to live freely, without outside authority in things psychic and somatic. It means that the baby feeds when it is hungry; that it becomes clean in habits only when it wants to; that it is never stormed at or spanked; that it is always loved and protected [1964, p. 105, italics Neill's].
>
> I believe that to impose anything by authority is wrong. The child should not do anything until he comes to the opinion -- his own opinion -- that it should be done [p. 114, italics Neill's].
>
> Every child has the right to wear clothes of such a kind that it does not matter a brass farthing if they get messy or not [p. 115].
>
> Furniture to a child is practically nonexistent. So at Summerhill we buy old car seats and old bus seats. And in a month or two they look

like wrecks. Every now and again at mealtime, some youngster waiting for his second helping will while away the time by twisting his fork almost into knots [p. 138].

Really, any man or woman who tries to give children freedom should be a millionnaire, for it is not fair that the natural carelessness of children should always be in conflict with the economic factor [p. 139].

Hegel by contrast defines freedom as the appreciation of necessity. According to Hegel, man has no choice but to act in accord with natural law until by disciplined knowledge he changes the physical or social reality he finds onerous. Man becomes free by overcoming his own ignorance, weakness, and immaturity, and not by living without law. Only the man who governs himself is free. Or, in the words of Bob Dylan,

> To live outside the law you must be honest.
>
> I know you always <u>say</u> you do agree... ("Absolutely Sweet Marie")

Or Kris Kristofferson, in "Me and Bobby McGee":

> Freedom's just another word for nothing left to lose,
>
> And nothing ain't worth nothing, but it's free...

The amount of freedom from constraint which is associated in the child with expressions of independence increases with age, but total freedom from constraint is neither possible nor desireable. The truly independent person is free either to conform with and obey the dictates of his peer group or an authority whose power he recognizes as legitimate, or to disregard in his decisionmaking known standards of conduct, normative expectations, and pronouncements of authorities he regards

as illegitimate. True independence of spirit is predicated upon a sense of social responsibility.

The belief in one's own power and the assumption of responsibility for one's own intellectual successes and failures are important predictors of independent effort and intellectual achievement (Crandall, Katkovsky, & Crandall, 1965). This sense of self-responsibility in children seems to be associated not with freedom from restraint but rather with power-oriented techniques of discipline and with critical attitudes on the part of the adult towards the child, provided of course that the parent is also concerned with developing the child's autonomy and encourages independent and individual behavior.

Wolfgang Lederer, a psychoanalytically trained psychiatrist in San Francisco, in an essay on positive superego functions had this to say:

> Particularly among the psychologically sophisticated -- the educated middle classes, the suburbanites and exurbanites, the fellow professionals, the workers in ancillary psychological disciplines, and among some of our colleagues -- certain characteristic pedagogical attitudes, supposedly psychoanalytically based, can be observed:
>
> There is the fear of inhibiting the child, of causing repressions -- as if repressions, rather than necessary conditions of civilized living, were some diabolic evil; the corresponding need to permit the child unlimited self-expression -- even where this becomes quite insufferable to the adult and anxiety-provoking for the child; the

reluctance to guide the child or to instruct it;[7] a need, in the parents, for love and approval from the child (rather than vice versa) as if they were continuously on trial, and the child their judge; a fear of spontaneous reactions, based on a corresponding need to analyze the oedipal implications of every emotion; an other-directed uncertainty about right and wrong, in consequence of which the child's age-mate from down the street may turn out to be the arbiter of what is or is not done; a sensitivity to the child's anger -- as if it were possible to keep it eternally happy -- and a corresponding reluctance to assume the onus and responsibility of any unpopular decision. And thus it would seem that this our "century of the child" has deprived the child of a -- responsible -- parent [1964, pp. 72-73].

Clearly there are viable alternatives of adult control which suit the goals of some parents and educators better than authoritative adult control. In closing I would like to present two possible alternatives to authoritative control, which I regard as of sufficient interest to merit further study and evaluation.

For the adult who values conformity more than dissent: Even today in the United States authoritarian child care practices, provided they are not accompanied by the authoritarian personality syndrome and support rather than conflict with normative behavior for the social group of which the adult is a part, may be effective. In an interesting study of social norms and authoritarianism, Kagitcibasi (1970) showed that her subjects in the United States who scored high on content areas

of authoritarianism (i.e., respect for authority and high value placed on obedience) were more likely to suffer from the authoritarian personality syndrome (i.e., dogmatic and intolerant attitudes, motivated by repressed anger, emotional coldness, and a sense of impotence) than their Turkish counterparts:

> Obedience to justified authority is a basic code of decency and morality in Turkey, and a valued historical tradition. However, this obedience, coming from social norms, seems to carry different overtones than the blind obedience and submission, mixed with repressed hostility, that the authoritarian personality postulated on a psychodynamic basis [p. 445].

In this country quasi-authoritarian practices characterize third world adults in their relationships with their children by comparison with white middle class liberals. Third world adults stand as an effective buffer between the child and the larger community. Black parents who are upwardly mobile and fiercely protective of their young are acting in accord with the social norms of the segregated community and can command the loyalty of their children. Obedience to family rules (as among the social elite) produces rewards which can be obtained in no other way, and requires of the child not submissive or servile qualities but rather aggressive, competitive qualities. In a recent study (1972, in press), for example, we found that the parents of black girls, by comparison with those of white girls, demanded strict obedience and early maturity, and placed little value on expression of

individuality. However, these childrearing practices designated as Authoritarian appeared to affect black and white girls quite differently. Black daughters of Authoritarian parents, when compared to white girls, were significantly more Domineering and Independent, and somewhat more Resistive and Dominant. These differences were all the more striking in view of the fact that there were no significant black-white differences in child behavior in the total sample. Perhaps the crucial factor present in the black authoritarian home and conspicuously absent in its white counterpart in this study was the equalitarian relationship between the parents and the active role in decision-making which the mothers took. It may be that white authoritarian female models who do not suffer from the authoritarian personality syndrome and are themselves strong and self-determining and not subservient to their male counterparts, would also generate independence and dominance in their female charges.

For the adult who values dissent more than conformity: An interesting pattern of childrearing was identified during our most recent study of current patterns of parental authority and their effects on the behavior of preschool children. While in the study proper, pattern membership was determined by multiple criteria, defined theoretically and then operationally by standard scores, the eight families placed in this pattern, designated Harmonious, had but one identifying characteristic in common. The observer assigned to study each of these families would not rate the family on the items defining the construct designated Firm Enforcement. In each case, the observer stated that any

rating on these items would be misleading, since the parent, while he or she almost never exercised control, seemed to have control in the sense that the child generally took pains to intuit what the parent wanted and to do it.

The atmosphere in these families was characterized by harmony, equanimity, and rationality:

> While Permissive parents avoided exercising control but were angry about not having control, and Authoritarian and Authoritative parents exercised control willingly, Harmonious parents seemed neither to exercise control, nor to avoid the exercise of control. Instead, they focussed upon achieving a quality of harmony in the home, and upon developing principles for resolving differences and for right living. Often they lost interest in actually resolving a difference once agreement upon principles of resolution had been reached. These parents brought the child up to their level in an interaction but did not reverse roles by acting childishly, as did some Permissive and Nonconforming parents. Harmonious parents were equalitarian in that they recognized differences based upon knowledge and personality, and tried to create an environment in which all family members could operate from the same vantage point, one in which the recognized differences in power did not put the child at a disadvantage. They lived parallel to the mainstream rather than in opposition to it. In their hierarchy of values honesty, harmony, justice, and rationality in human relations took precedence over power, achievement, control,

and order, although they also saw the practical importance of the latter values [Baumrind, 1971a, p. 101].

The effects of Harmonious childrearing patterns on children appeared sex-related. The six daughters of Harmonious parents were extraordinarily competent and very similar in their scores on the child behavior measures. Their average Stanford-Binet IQ was 136 (that of the entire sample was also high, 128). On clusters derived from scores on the Preschool Behavior Q Sort, when compared to others, these girls were Achievement Oriented, Friendly, and Independent. By contrast, the two boys whose parents were classified as Harmonious, while Cooperative, were notably Submissive, Aimless, Not Achievement Oriented, and Dependent. The Harmonious pattern of childrearing seemed to produce an effeminate orientation in boys (if one can say much about two cases) while the effect in girls was entirely positive. In girls, high achievement and independence resulted, without loss of a feminine (i.e., cooperative and tractable) disposition (Baumrind, 1971b).

While the data mentioned here must be viewed as speculative because of the manner in which the group members were identified, there is provisional support for the distinctive characteristics of this pattern of childrearing and its effects in two additional studies. In one study[8] a sample of 103 tenth grade students from a high school in Berkeley were interviewed concerning their attitudes towards authority and relevant social issues, their feelings about their parents, their use of drugs, and their sexual mores. On the basis of their patterning

of scores they were assigned to 5 types (designated Principled Humanist; Anti-Authority, Achievement Oriented; Anti-Establishment; Nonconformist-Harmonious; and Overconformists). The type designated Nonconformist-Harmonious appeared to have been brought up in a manner very similar to the Harmonious pattern of authority described above. These subjects scored high on clusters designated Concordance with Parents and Obeys Rules Willingly, and low on Achievement Oriented. Although both their parents and the adolescents themselves were not achievement oriented, this group had significantly higher grades, better class ranks, and more honors than other types of students. While proportionately fewer of this group applied to college than students of other types, those who did were more likely to apply to Universities than to junior colleges. These youngsters, while not conforming to establishment values, were in fact instrumentally competent and possessed the skills which would permit them to compete successfully academically and professionally if they so chose.

In a second relevant study Block, Haan, and Smith (1969) distinguished between Activist Students and Dissenters. Activist students were identified by having engaged in protest activities such as FSM sit-ins or peace demonstrations. The students in this group who had not engaged in social service activities as well, such as tutoring or helping the handicapped, were designated Dissenters and their responses to an inquiry concerning their parents' childrearing practices were compared to the responses of the remainder, designated Activists.

The parents of Activists and Dissenters were both described as nonconforming, and encouraging of self-expression. The Dissenters were most negative of all groups (other groups were designated Inactives, Conventionalists, and Constructivists) in their evaluation of the parent-child relationship and saw their parents as laissez-faire, nondisciplining, and inconsistent, and placing little emphasis on genuine independence or early maturity. By contrast, the Activists saw their parents as encouraging independence and demanding early maturity. Childrearing practices of Dissenters' parents were like those of Permissive parents in our study, while childrearing practices of Activists were like those of Harmonious parents. Thus once again there is evidence that a nonconforming but nonpermissive orientation can be associated with constructive nonconformity in the child, while a permissive orientation is more likely to be associated with destructive nonconformity.

The authoritative, harmonious, and quasi-authoritarian adults described here as effective all had certain characteristics in common although they differed in other respects. These effective adults respected natural and social reality and took issue with "law" only in the service of a principle. They understood that all actions produced consequences and exposed the children whom they influenced to the consequences of their actions rather than intervening to protect them. Their concern was with character formation more than with behavior control. They personified qualities of self-assertion and

self-sufficiency, and they valued these qualities in children. In all instances, although towards varying goals, these adults chose to steer and not to drift, although to act meant to err and thus to accept existential guilt.

FOOTNOTES:

[1]The program of research discussed in this paper was supported by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, research grant HD 02228.

[2]Dr. Robert B. Davis, letter to invited participants in NIE conference.

[3]I find the notion that white middle-class youths provide the ideal model for youths of other cultures a bit presumptuous, and even absurd in view of the rejection of achievement and economic success which characterizes very many middle-class children and their parents today.

[4]It is ironic that the traditional methods which succeeded so well at John Muir are being abandoned this year to be replaced by an experimental federally funded program.

[5]The proposal by such groups as the Association of Black Psychologists that there be a moratorium on testing of black children makes as much sense as to behead the bearer of bad tidings in order to change the news. Rather, initial low scores obtained by their children on IQ and achievement tests should be used by parents, black or white, as a basis for demanding superior formal education, and changes in test scores as an indication that effective educational intervention has in fact occurred.

[6]Dr. Peter Lenrow in his work sensitively details and documents the negative effects on participants in an educational experience of such violations of trust, and I certainly agree with him.

[7]In spite of Hartmann's early warning: "Passive behavior in educators is just as much an 'intervention' as active behavior . . . nonprohibition just as much as prohibition..." (1939, p. 85) [Lederer's note].

[8]"Types of adolescent life-styles," unpublished report on 1968 study of 10th grade students at Berkeley High School, 1971.

REFERENCES

Baumrind, D. Child care practices anteceding three patterns of preschool behavior. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1967, 75, 43-88.

Baumrind, D. Current patterns of parental authority. Developmental Psychology Monograph, 1971, 4 (1), part 2. (a)

Baumrind, D. Harmonious parents and their preschool children. Developmental Psychology, 1971, 4 (1), 99-102. (b)

Baumrind, D. An exploratory study of socialization effects on black children: some black-white comparisons. Child Development, March 1972, in press.

Bereiter, C., & Engelmann, S. Teaching disadvantaged children in the preschool. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Bing, E. Effect of childrearing practices on development of differential cognitive abilities. Child Development, 1963, 34 (3), 631-648.

Block, J.H., Haan, N., & Smith, M.B. Socialization correlates of student activism. Journal of Social Issues, 1969, 25 (4), 143-177.

Bronfenbrenner, U. Two worlds of childhood: U.S. and U.S.S.R. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1970.

Coleman, J.S., et al. Equality of educational opportunity. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Crandall, V., Katkovsky, W., & Crandall, V.J. Children's beliefs in their own control of reinforcements in intellectual-academic achievement situations. Child Development, 1965, 36, 91-109.

Crutchfield, R.S., & Covington, M.V. Programmed instruction and creativity. Programmed Instruction, 1965, 4, 1.

Dubin, E.R., & Dubin, R. The authority inception period in socialization. Child Development, 1964, 34, 885-898.

Farnham-Diggory, S. Cognitive synthesis in negro and white children. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 1970. 35 (135, no. 2).

Gagné, R.M. The conditions of learning. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1965.

Gagné, R.M. Instruction and the conditions of learning. In L. Siegel (Ed.), Instruction: some contemporary viewpoints. San Francisco: Chandler, 1967.

Hartmann, H. Ego psychology and the problem of adaptation. New York: International Universities Press, 1958 [1939].

Hess, R.D. & Shipman, V.C. Early experience and the socialization of cognitive modes in children. Child Development, 1965, 36, 869-886.

Jensen, A.R. How much can we boost IQ and scholastic achievement? Harvard Educational Review, 1969, 39, 1-123.

Kagitcibasi, C. Social norms and authoritarianism: a Turkish-American comparison. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 16 (3), 444-451.

Kersh, B.Y. The adequacy of "meaning" as an explanation for superiority of learning by independent discovery. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1958, 49, 282-292.

Lederer, W. Dragons, delinquents, and destiny. Psychological Issues Monograph, 1964, 4 (15).

Lenrow, P.B. Preschool facilitation of convergent and divergent cognitive modes: what price acceleration? Paper presented at annual meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, 1967.

Levenstein, P. Cognitive growth in preschoolers through verbal interaction with mothers. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1970, 40, 426-432.

Neill, A.S. Summerhill. New York: Hart, 1964.

Pettigrew, T.F. Race and equal educational opportunity. Paper presented at the Symposium on the Implications of the Coleman Report on Equality of educational opportunity at the annual convention of the American Psychological Association, 1967.

Rambusch, N. Learning how to learn: an American approach to Montessori. Baltimore: Helicon, 1962.

Roethlisberger, F.J., & Dickson, W.J. Management and the worker. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1939.

Wittrock, M.C. The learning by discovery hypothesis. In L.S. Shulman & E.R. Keislar (Eds.), Learning by discovery: a critical appraisal. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.